

Migration Policy against the Background of Transformations in Public Policy Models. The Presence of the Concept of Governance in Polish Migration Policy¹

Introduction

From the perspective of public policy, contemporary migration is a broad and multi-faceted phenomenon. It particularly concerns the labour market, social security, education, family policy, social welfare, and healthcare. For decades, Poland was an emigration country, and many studies continue to point to the problem of mass economic emigration of Poles. A change has been observed in recent years, however, and Poland is increasingly also an immigration country, albeit for many migrants mostly a transit destination. Among the foreigners staying in Poland legally, the dominant groups are Ukrainians, Russians, Vietnamese, and Belarusians (Polakowski, Szelewa 2013: 11). Paid employment is one of their main motives for migration.

Migration policy is also among the most debated areas of policy in public debate. The European migration crisis is analysed from a number of perspectives, including the economic, political, demographic and social angles. The numerous difficult issues raised by migration include the practice of awarding citizenship on the basis of parents' citizenship or place of birth, refusal to accept

¹ This chapter is based on the article "Podejście governance w polityce publicznej jako inspiracja dla uczenia się współdziałania dorosłych. Przykład gdańskiej polityki migracyjnej" ("Idea of governance in public policy like a space of adult education on the example of Gdańsk migration policy"), published in Polish in the journal *Rocznik Andragogiczny* 2017, no. 24.

immigrants, and non-inclusion of the interested parties themselves in the debate (Bauder, Matheis 2016).

In recent times, major changes have occurred in the models of public policies. Western European countries are characterised by an advanced process of transition “from government to (joint) governance”. Governments are developing new methods for solving social problems, mostly in a system of partnerships, which generates a larger plane of collective interest than was previously the case (Zybała 2015: 32). Participatory public governance is known as joint governance, with the fundamental premises of such a model being interaction with stakeholders (citizens, non-governmental organisations, businesses), application of the principle of participation and consultation, openness, transparency, responsibility, and sustainable development (Szumowski 2014: 91–95). As a new model of public administration with the participation of society, governance is also becoming an important educational field. By participating in the social space, all political entities are “forced” to reflect and to be creative (Hausner 2007: 55). We can call this learning through action, learning through participation, or participatory learning.

Migration policy formed in accordance with the concept of governance seems today almost to be a necessity. It is able to constitute an excellent space for learning citizenship and tolerance for diversity. Additionally, if we wish to create a modern migration policy in Poland, then it is especially important for this to be based on the principles of governance. Is the idea of governance present in Polish migration policy at government or local-government level, and what educational possibilities can it have in the context of migration policy in the country? This article will attempt to answer these questions, based on an analysis of subject literature as well as materials in the form of reports and government/local-government documents on Polish migration policy.

The concept and scope of public policy

The word “policy” is usually connoted with the concept of government and administration. It embodies the action of steering the behaviour of other people with the aim of achieving specific objectives. Though there are many types of policies, in the context of actions intended to act in the public interest we speak of “public policy”. The word “public” can mean “universal”, “civic” or “open”. H. George Frederickson (Suwaj 2009: 34–35) identified five different meanings of the word in the context of public policy and administration:

- belonging to interest groups (groups of individuals with the same interests);
- making a rational choice (referring to universal values and the “public interest”);
- representative (representing government);
- client-oriented (working in support of citizens);
- based on citizenship (providing support for civic activity).

Public policy today is one of the most important areas of social life, at both the central and the local level, since the public sector comprises the government and local-government sector. The increasing scope of activity of contemporary states has led to a greater number of both public initiatives and individual policies is growing markedly. Their quality, standards, functions, efficiency, and particularly the process of formation and of designating objectives are controversial topics in debates in academia, press discourse, and society. The extent of state interventionism in citizens’ lives also constitutes a separate category of discussion.

Public policy is developing both as an academic discipline in the field of social sciences and as a practice of solving diverse public problems associated with the operations of the state. Harold Lasswell, acknowledged as the founder of public policy theory, described it as an applied field of knowledge that combines the activity of academics, decision makers and citizens and refers to systemic and regulated programming of influence on key collective problems (Zybała 2012a: 23–24). Lasswell also noted that as an academic discipline it should deal with researching problem-solving methods that are an inextricable element of functioning in contemporary society. From a practical point of view, public policy can be seen as the interrelated decisions and actions undertaken by government serving specific objectives in spaces where the mechanisms of the market economy do not apply or would not be sufficiently efficient (Woźnicki 2012: 133).

In the broadest sense, public policy denotes rationalised public initiatives and programmes (or the lack thereof) based upon assembled and relatively objective knowledge and a systematic process of designing and carrying out these actions (Zybała 2012a: 24). It means regulating public tasks, from their design, via their realisation, to evaluation of the results. According to another definition, public policy means a deliberate and purposeful process of realising general premises in specific spheres of citizens’ lives, which may result from the “visions” of the government at both central and local level, with the objective

of meeting social needs. Public policy in this sense regulates (and plans) public tasks, which the public administration then puts into place (Suwaj, Szczepankowski 2009: 305–306).

Analysis of public policy covers all the entities and situations within its scope. These include: institutional actors and the decision-making processes shaped by them; techniques of balancing interests, exchange of experiences and searching for optimum solutions; processes of formulating objectives and tasks and their implementation; formation of intermediary bodies and studies of efficiency and effectiveness in realisation of public policies; analysis of sectoral policies (models, instruments, methods and indicators of realisation, evaluation) (Woźnicki 2012: 135–136). Among the stakeholders of public policies are the government, opposition, administration staff, NGO activists and their professional counterparts, as well as informal citizens' groups and individuals.

Public policy today is characterised by three main fields of action – programme choices (programmes, strategies, projects), implementation of public programmes (initiatives carried out by the administration and collaborators from the NGO sector, for example), and the results of public initiatives and their impact on citizens' lives (these are not the same as products, which are limited) (Zybała 2013: 42–43). The first two areas highlight the fact that contemporary public policy does not depend on just one entity, e.g. the state, but on many institutions involved in the process of its programming and execution. It is a process of regulated and targeted actions of various entities with the objective of the good of citizens.

Public policy initiatives can be divided into the following categories:

- information, education and consultation – transmission of knowledge to society (publication of statistical data, realisation of information and social campaigns, consultation for business and NGOs);
- direct intervention – provision of services through the public authorities directly for society, or commissioning these services to private institutions;
- economic instruments – influencing the economic conditions in which public and private entities operate (adjusting tax levels, receiving fees for public services, introduction of school vouchers, receiving set environmental fees, licensing public services);
- regulation and legislation – passing laws to regulate social behaviours;
- market-based solutions – soft interventions including setting joint norms with business, agreements, committees, consultations, action codes, self-regulation (Zybała 2012a: 137–142).

The form of public policy in a given country is influenced by factors that affect this process, including:

- cultural – different countries have varying historical and cultural traditions in this respect (e.g. solving public problems based on top-down or bottom-up initiatives);
- economic – the shape and directions of public policies are determined by a given country's economic situation (economic growth/crisis, developed/developing countries etc.);
- political – the realisation or neglect of initiatives in a specific field depends on the existing political order and coalitions of specific interests;
- institutional factors – the existence or lack of the institutional potential to achieve the aims of a given policy and the functioning model of public administration (Kozaczka 2016: 329).

Referring to cultural factors, Andrzej Zybała cites Francis G. Castle in identifying the following profiles of policies characteristic of Anglo-Saxon, German-speaking, Latin/Southern, and Scandinavian countries. Anglo-Saxon societies have an individualistic outlook, while Scandinavian ones have a more community-based approach. Latin countries, meanwhile, have long traditions of strong bottom-up support for the actions of the central government (Zybała 2015: 44). These differing approaches overlap with varying expectations regarding public initiatives in the individual societies. In Anglo-Saxon countries, a large proportion of society is distrustful of public actions imposed by the state on a top-down basis. These are viewed as inefficient and not needs-based. Social needs are met better by the market or mechanisms of social self-organisation. The citizens of countries in continental Europe (France, Germany) have more faith in the ability of public institutions to meet citizens' needs and solve problems through top-down initiatives.

Apart from historical-cultural differences, another important factor shaping public policies is the type of approach taken by the authorities to problem solving, as well as their relations with other actors in the policy formation process (a continuum from decision-making monocentrism to collaboration). Also significant are the policy community's "power" and ability to reach an agreement both internally and in relations with government. Furthermore, many authors underline the importance of the social relations dominant in a given country and their impact on public-policy actors' (stakeholders') design and execution of public initiatives (Zybała 2015: 45–47). To a greater or lesser

extent, all these questions determine the model of public policy practised in a given country.

With public policies taking up an increasingly large sphere of social life, implementation of further regulations also entails introduction of mechanisms for seeking consent. The most common ones include persuasion (the long-term process of putting forward rationales and arguments during debates and consultations), negotiations (encompassing a wide range of effects, from exerting social pressure to manipulating information) and bilateral benefits (instilling the belief in the need for joint action to achieve common goals) (Górniak, Mazur 2012: 218–219). The modern approach to public policies involves a growing space for participatory mechanisms for negotiating them.

This way of pursuing public policy is not yet fully popularised in Poland, where policies continue to be formed and executed in a traditional manner. Owing to the country's lack of experience in pluralistic administration of public problems, it is the state and local government that continue to be the main agents of public policy. NGOs and private entities are observed to a considerably lesser extent. Poland is characterised by statism of public administration, with the state playing a dominant role, employing hard governing tools (legislation), regardless of their low efficiency (excessive use of legislative instruments leads to rising costs of public actions without securing better public services for society). The most common instrument for shaping public policies in Poland is enacting of laws only marginally underpinned by elements of deliberation, expert knowledge or dialogue with stakeholders. Mechanisms for verifying the results are also not applied on a large scale. Joint action with stakeholders of individual policies is lacking. As a result, for example, they may not have the necessary potential to realise the premises of the legislation, and subsequent statutory records are also not put into place. Increasingly, Poland is said to be lacking public policies in the Western European sense. The reason for this is the lack of a systematised, rationalised process of designing and evaluating public actions, as well as of a systemic, cohesive process of analysis of collective problems upon which to base initiatives. Poland is dominated by arbitrary, ad hoc initiatives often founded on politicians' intuitive and non-substantive premises.

Migration policy in the public policy system

The subject literature contains a number of definitions of migration policy. Some emphasise the purposes, others the instruments used, and others still the social functions. According to Antoni Rajkiewicz, “migration policy is a comprehensive system of legal/institutional indications and regulations affecting the formation of the dimensions, structure and directions of the processes of migration, taking into account both the demographic and socio-economic situation and the binding international norms and bilateral agreements” (Rajkiewicz 2004: 8). Maciej Duszczyk writes that the concepts of migration policy and immigration policy are often used interchangeably, without any justification in terms of their scope. He shows that migration policy is a broader concept, referring to all state activity connected to the spatial movement of people. Immigration policy has a narrower meaning, encompassing “policy regarding the entry (e.g. visa policy and border control) and stay of foreigners, policy of encouragement/discouragement of the arrival of specific categories of foreigners in a given country, including for employment purposes (selective immigration policy), as well as integration policy” (Duszczyk 2013: 36). Henryk Chałupczak proposes a definition based on political science, arguing that a state’s migration policy is “a set of actions adopted and realised by a decision-making body (public authority represented by entities specified by law) determined by domestic and international factors, aiming for efficient solution of migration problems” (Chałupczak 2013: 5).

Public policy regarding immigrants can be divided into two main areas of state intervention. It can be treated as a set of conditions that an immigrant must fulfil in order to obtain the right to remain legally in a country (immigration policy) or as a set of policy instruments applied to immigrants already living there (immigrant policy). The latter is usually based on the social policy model binding in a given country. If a liberal social policy is dominant, the material situation of both the citizens of the host country and the immigrants is left up to the logic of the market. In the social democratic model of social policy, immigrants enjoy the same social entitlements as citizens of the host society, although to gain access to at least some of these entitlements it may be necessary to be a citizen of the country in question (Polakowski, Szelewa 2013: 9–10). Polish policy towards immigrants occupies a place between a liberal and a social democratic model. Many studies on immigrants concentrate on their usefulness on the Polish labour market (labour market-based immigrant

policy), suggesting that this is the most important aspect (Szyłko-Skoczny, Duszczyk 2010: 2–5). Polish social policy is a mixture of the welfare state model and the liberal model, with strong features of a socialist system. Notably, the liberal trend is more evident in immigration policy.

The typology of migration policy models proposed by Marek Okólski stems from different origins, based on the characteristics that dominate in the migration policy of countries experienced in working with immigrants. Okólski mentions:

- The model of complementary migration policy – immigrants are mostly perceived in terms of the needs of the national economy and treated as a complementary source of workforce on the national labour market. This model excludes mass immigration on the basis of selection of immigrants in terms of ability to assimilate and usefulness on the labour market. States putting such a migration model policy into practice are Australia and Canada, with the closest in Europe being the United Kingdom.
- The model of colonial-humanitarian migration policy – immigrants from certain regions of the world have special rights and simplified procedures for obtaining the right to enter a given state, usually resulting from historical experiences, mostly from the colonial era. These countries thus attempt to compensate for the time in which they controlled their colonies. Typical examples of this model are France, Belgium and Holland.
- The model of new immigration states – this displays a liberal approach to immigration, whose main objective is to fill the shortages in the labour market. No selection of immigrants is practised (as in the complementary model), on the assumption that the market itself will lead to adjustment of supply and demand. This model often results in foreigners replenishing the black economy. Typical examples of such states are Spain, Portugal and Finland.
- The model of residual or assimilatory migration policy – immigration to the country is only possible after fulfilling restrictive conditions concerning usefulness for the labour market and economy and capacity to adapt to the society (assimilation). This model leads to immigration being limited from countries with different cultural and social norms. Characteristic states employing this model are Austria and Japan.
- The model of multicultural migration policy – which views competition between cultural circles as beneficial for a country's social and economic

development. The state safeguards what it considers to be the optimal proportions of participation of representatives of given nations in migration streams, preferring immigration of people under-represented in the society of the host state. A characteristic example is the United States (Okólski 2008: 4–5).

Poland is an emigration-immigration country, and the most useful experiences it can call upon are those of states applying complementary migration policy models and the solutions functioning in new immigration countries. The priority of Poland's immigration policy should be to fill shortages on the Polish labour market and encourage immigrant workers who will not compete with Polish workers (Kaczmarczyk 2014: 3). Demographic realities should prompt an active immigration policy targeted particularly at migrants with high professional qualifications (Szyłko-Skoczny, Duszczyk 2010).

Major changes have taken place in migration policy in Poland since 1989, and we can identify four characteristic periods (Łodziński, Szonert 2017). The first was the institutionalisation of Polish migration policy (1989–1997). This was characterised by Poland's adoption of international law regarding protection of refugees and ratification of the 1951 Refugee Convention signed in Geneva, the Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees. In this period, Poland signed an agreement with the Schengen countries, as well as, in 1997, adopting a Law on Foreigners. This was a time of "opening borders" after forty years of communist rule, and the beginning of regulation of Polish migration policy based on democratic rules and a human rights-based system. The country cautiously began to open up to immigration and allowing foreigners to live within its borders. An important aspect of the migration policy was the laws passed which facilitated the return of Polish emigrants as well as admission of repatriates – particularly Poles living in the former USSR.

The second period of Polish migration policy was its Europeanisation (1998–2004). The Law on Foreigners was amended, and a Law on Repatriation was enacted. Work was done in this period to adapt Polish law to European Union requirements and establish governmental positions regarding integration of foreigners.

The third period was stabilisation of Polish migration policy (2005–2015). The phenomenon that dominated public debate at the time was the wave of emigration of Poles that resulted from the opening of the borders of EU countries. A change also took place in repatriation policy (the so-called Pole's Card – *Karta Polaka*), while regulations concerning foreigners working in Poland

were relaxed. Poland became one of the few EU states in which citizens of several Eastern European countries acquired open access to the labour market for temporary or seasonal work. The foundations of Polish migration policy were also delineated. Owing to the lack of wider debate in society on these issues, the state administration was the driving force behind the changes, backed by an expert community. In 2007 the Migration Affairs Committee was appointed, which two years later commenced work on the document *Poland's Migration Policy – Current Position and Proposed Actions*. The government accepted the document in July 2012. Poland also became an increasingly attractive destination for migrants, particularly as a result of the conflict in Ukraine in 2014. In official data from 2015, almost 200,000 foreigners had valid documents confirming their right to stay in Poland.

The last three years have been a period of “controlled hospitality”. Poland has adopted a strategy of “between the European Union and the Visegrad Group” in response to the migrant crisis in Europe (2015–2016). Along with other Visegrad countries, Poland's government opposed the mandatory quota system for distribution of refugees among EU member states, arguing that it would not halt the wave of immigration to EU countries, but rather do the opposite. A key argument in the debate on responses to the migrant crisis is the need to prepare Poland for the potential increase in immigration from Ukraine. For Poland, opening eastwards is important for demographic and economic reasons. On account of this attitude, along with the way that the debate was held in Poland and in international forums, a negative image formed of a country hostile in its approach to immigrants.

On 18 October 2016, the Polish cabinet approved the annulment of the document *Poland's Migration Policy – Current Position and Proposed Actions* as well as the *Implementation Plan* for this document. A certain chapter in the history of Polish migration policy was thus closed. For now, according to experts of the Warsaw-based Centre of Migration Research, the Polish state is promoting neither a multicultural nor an intercultural approach, and the integration policy that the country is following can be described as “assimilation through omission”. However, the definitional perspective of public policies suggests that “omission” is also a form of public policy.

The concept of governance in the context of migration policy and its educational aspects

Since the 1970s, something of a shift has taken place in European countries, from the state as an interventionist institution to the state as a regulatory institution (privatisation, liberalisation and deregulation in public policies (Zybała 2013: 27). Public administration has also been refined (attempting to combine managerial professionalism with clear responsibility for the addressees and beneficiaries of public actions (Hausner 2008: 47) as a means of conducting public policies. The model of public administration accepted in a given country is at present the aspect that has a major impact on the formation and implementation of the policies of interest to us. Andrzej Zybała, citing Michael P. Howlett, describes the four most common models of public administration. One is based on administration through legislation, where the main emphasis of public initiatives is placed upon constructing legal regulations allowing a structure of order to be created in public relations. Based on legal regulations, the authorities grant the right to participate in various activities as well as to receive specific privileges. The next model is described as administration by corporations, which are groups representing social interests (e.g. trade unions). Together with the government, corporate partners create control mechanisms for socio-economic phenomena (pacts, agreements) and undertake joint responsibility for the planned actions. Another model is market-based administration, characterised by use in public administration of the rules of competition in the area of social services – “new public management”. The final model is network-based administration, where the key element is the relations between various groups and their collaboration in realisation of public tasks – “public governance” or simply “governance” (Zybała 2013: 33–34).

Public governance treats citizens not as consumers, but as stakeholders with their own point of view. They therefore have the right to actively participate in public life, as well as to carry out continual checks on the government, rather than just at elections. The concept of governance in development of public policies emphasises the importance of social capital, civil society and a high level of social participation, which is especially significant in planning and implementation of the adopted solutions. This idea has become a popular buzzword, as it is seen as a remedy for the crisis of civic participation in many countries, expected to increase citizens’ involvement in the public sphere by giving them

a voice in decisions on the shape of the public sector. These initiatives have two aims: to increase citizens' participation in decision-making processes, thus potentially improving them; and to improve the quality of public services, while increasing citizens' support and approval of the proposed changes (the idea of forming and implementing a mechanism for approving the quality of social services, making maximum use of local resources).

Input from citizens can apply to legislative and deliberative processes as well as to executive ones. This may involve the use of various forms of participatory (e.g. social consultations, referendums) and deliberative democracy (e.g. deliberative polls, citizens' juries), as well as by means of lobbying, protest, civil disobedience and advocacy. Such initiatives may take place at various tiers – from central (government and parliament), via regional, to county and commune/city level. Involvement of citizens in decision-making processes is largely undertaken and monitored by the public authorities in the course of their statutory administrative and management duties.

To allow this, however, society must be invited to participate in joint governance. Despite the widespread conviction that administrative entities invite the public to enter dialogue, observation of many such situations leads me to believe that these initiatives are either highly incompetent or mere lip service. Poles lost the sense of self-determination a long time ago, and shift the responsibility for their own fate onto the state (Giza-Poleszczuk 2007: 72). The reconstruction of the paradigm of joint governance requires time and much action at both central and local level for policies to become instruments of intentional and deliberate formation of society's attitudes.

In this context, work with local communities becomes a very important element of the creation and realisation of programmes and public policies. Poland has even witnessed the development of public pedagogy as theoretical and practical reflection, focusing on the "mechanisms of education and development of society through systemic/institutional interaction" (Skrzypczak 2016: 30). The concept of joint governance is based upon networking, multi-level administration, learning compromise, dialogue, and public participation.

The publications of the UK-based Institute for Government point to the reflective and teaching nature of joint production of public policies. This applies to both the design phase and the actual construction of a system of implementation, and finally evaluation (Skrzypczak 2016: 92–95). In the case of joint formation of migration policy, this becomes particularly significant as it may serve to transform attitudes in society towards this complex phenomenon and to eliminate social conflicts.

As with other public policies, the state is no longer the only actor in this field. Other institutions – both public and private, including immigrants themselves – are also involved in the creation and implementation of migration policy. The model solutions in designating the objectives of migration policy should be realised in cooperation between the state- and local-government levels. Terms used in relation to this process include “multi-level polity”, “governance in a multi-level system”, “multi-tiered system of governance” (Matusz-Protasiewicz 2013: 77). Multi-level governance of migration denotes negotiating important decisions at the various territorial levels. But this is not common practice. In Poland as well as in other European countries, local governments have a minimal role in formation of migration policy. They are often presented with a “fait accompli”, and conflict situations sometimes ensue, as with Bavaria’s opposition to being forced to accept immigrants as a result of the German state migration policy.

Analysis of Polish strategic documents concerning migration policy suggests that the idea of governance is almost entirely absent. According to *Poland’s Migration Policy – Current Position and Proposed Actions*, in Poland in the 1990s, “owing to the low interest of society in migration issues (non-governmental organisations were also less numerous and active than at present), the solutions and decisions proposed by the appropriate state institutions were undertaken and put into place without public debates and political discussions (*Polityka migracyjna...*: 6). This document contains a number of indications concerning the directions of Polish migration policy, yet says nothing about developing it in a participatory fashion, either through Polish society or through the immigrant diasporas).

Migration Policy as an Instrument for Promotion of Employment and Restriction of Unemployment, the expert report summarising the theoretical and empirical experiences concerning the social and economic dimensions of integration (Module III – Integration of Foreigners in Poland), a project conducted within the European Social Fund, Operational Programme Efficient Human Resources (action 1.1a), recommends decentralisation of the structure and initiatives within migration policy. Central offices should play decision-making and supervisory roles, with local-government structures having consulting and implementation functions and a genuine influence on the decisions taken. The NGO sector and representatives of immigrant communities should also be invited to have an input.

A local-government document worth discussing in great detail is the Gdańsk Immigrant Integration Model (IIM), which, in my opinion, was created and put into practice using a governance-based approach. Gdańsk is the first city in Poland to have produced, and adopted with a resolution of the Municipal

Council, a document concerning integration of immigrants. This specifies the areas and directions of actions aiming to maintain an effective and efficient policy for the City of Gdańsk regarding integration of immigrants, and contains guidelines and recommendations for its implementation. The model gained the recognition and support of the Polish Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). Its original premise was to develop and implement concrete solutions targeted at immigrants already living and working in Gdańsk. This meant working out solutions to better address and solve their needs and problems. Yet this does not negate the need for work on and application of initiatives concerning accepting and supporting new immigrants arriving in Gdańsk, which will make it possible to face up to the challenges that will come with the expected growth in migration over the coming years.

The Immigrant Integration Model does not address the process of accepting and legalising the stay of foreigners in Poland, since Gdańsk city commune does not have decision-making authority in this regard. The main decision makers regarding acceptance of immigrants, including refugees, are the Polish government, the Ministry of the Interior and the Office for Foreigners. It is at this level that Polish migration policy is regulated, financial aid is awarded and immigrants' statuses are determined, which formally sanctions the stay of foreigners in Poland. The government administration only tasks the local communes with coordination of initiatives regarding integration of foreigners, and this is the subject of the Gdańsk document.

The IIM indicates the main areas and directions of actions aimed at conducting an effective and efficient integration policy within local government over a long timeframe. The model's main objective is to develop a system of administration of migration in public and social institutions in Gdańsk and to strengthen integration of immigrants in such areas as education, culture, social welfare, housing, prevention of violence and discrimination, local communities, employment, and health protection. In all these priorities, it presents the aims, tasks and specific initiatives. The participants in the integration process are the Municipal Family Support Centre, the Labour Office, the Tax Office, the City Council, the police, educational institutions (nurseries, pre-schools, schools, universities), language schools, healthcare institutions, employers, volunteers and NGOs. The IIM implementation team is to consist of four main entities:

- **Steering Committee**, consisting of representatives of the management staff of the most important – and key to implementation of the IIM – institutions and organisations in Gdańsk.

- **Management Group**, to include the leaders of the eight thematic areas in which the IIM will be implemented. It is possible to extend the composition of this body to include experts and leaders from other thematic areas not described in detail in the IIM, e.g. sport.
- **Integration and Migration Forum**, open to the largest possible number of institutions, organisations and individuals ready to develop and implement initiatives in the field of integration and migration in Gdańsk. The starting point for formation of this body is the need to create a space for exchanging knowledge and experiences in the area of integration of immigrants and supporting the development of the intercultural competences of the Gdańsk community.
- **Immigrants Council**, made up of representatives of immigrant communities living in Gdańsk – there is a need to stimulate the engagement of this community.

From the perspective of constructing local migration policies based on the concept of governance, the most interesting section is that on social consultations. These lasted several months and were carried out in various ways. Conferences and seminars, workshops and debates with residents, consultation meetings with significant people in the Gdańsk community, and study visits were all held. Online consultations also took place. An important and interesting element of the consultations was a mentoring visit by EUROCITIES (the network of the largest European cities) within the Integrating Cities project. The main subject of this visit was the issue of social communication and building contact with residents and public opinion in the field of migration and integration. EUROCITIES chose Barcelona and Ghent as well as MigrationWork from England to provide mentoring support and make visits to Gdańsk (Fedas, Siciarek, Olech 2016: 14–15).

Alongside social consultations at the stage of creation of the document, it also demonstrates the numerous opportunities for including NGOs and civic organisations in its implementation (Integration and Migration Forum, Migrants Council). Moreover, it opens a space for public debate on migration, offering a chance for acquisition of intercultural competences and for the Gdańsk community to learn tolerance to difference. Altogether, the initiatives are an excellent example of the use of the concept of governance in forming a local migration policy and putting it into place.

Gdańsk also boasts a number of good practices in the field of integration of immigrants. We can cite the experiences of the European Solidarity Centre,

which implemented the “Education and Civic Practices Programme for Immigrants Living in the Tricity” as early as 2014. The programme was an attempt to activate immigrants in the public sphere, a group not discerned by the state, local government or certain social and civic programmes, and often lacking support and the opportunity to participate and have a say in the issues affecting them. The programme was executed by an intersectoral partnership – the Centre for Support of Immigrants, European Solidarity Centre and CAL Local Activity Support Centre – and addressed to 20 immigrants of various nationalities and from various cultures, who applied in an open recruitment process.

Further initiatives are: a volunteer programme in cultural organisations/institutions as a means of integrating migrants; the Foreigners Club at the European Solidarity Centre library; actions on behalf of immigrants as a priority in a competition of the Provincial and Municipal Public Library in Gdańsk; collaboration between students of psychology and pedagogy of the University of Gdańsk Faculty of Social Sciences with Primary School no. 16 and Middle School no. 10 in Orunia Dolna in support of educational work in a multicultural school community; and finally, the conference “Good Practices Code for Businesses Interested in Employing Foreigners – How to Put Theory into Practice”, a collaborative venture between Pomerania Employers, the International Organization for Migration, the Gdańsk District Labour Office and Work Service S.A. with the support of the Pomeranian Provincial Office in Gdańsk.

Following the Gdańsk Immigrant Integration Model, in an attempt to emphasise the local governments’ separateness from state migration policy, the Union of Polish Metropolises issued a declaration on cooperation in migration issues. The mayors of Białystok, Bydgoszcz, Gdańsk, Katowice, Krakow, Lublin, Łódź, Poznań, Rzeszów, Szczecin, Warsaw, and Wrocław were signatories of the declaration, signed in Gdańsk on 30 June 2017, which stresses the openness of large cities to the processes of migration and diversity of residents. It also underlines the need for cooperation between local authorities and the state government, public services, NGOs, Churches, universities, cultural institutions, and business and labour market organisations. The mayors expressed their desire for partnership with various entities in forming and implementing Polish migration policy based on administering safe migrations. Unfortunately, no information is available on whether the declaration was previously consulted with the residents of the cities whose representatives expressed their desire for cooperation.

Conclusion

Based upon analysis of documents on migration policy as well as the subject literature, we can conclude that the development of migration policy in Poland, as well as in other European countries, is subject to different rules from other public policies. The minimal representation of the ideas of joint governance in migration policy at government level suggests that in Poland it is not evolving in the direction of modern concepts of public policies, but rather is stuck in the regulatory or corporate model. This is something of a concern, since migration is among the most difficult sectoral policies, and in order to avoid conflict situations, all government decisions ought to be supported by broad consultations with society. This applies both to the host community and to immigrants themselves.

Administration of migration from the central level is easier and faster, but unfortunately also less effective. The European Union migration policy in force in recent years has often even omitted the government level (let alone the local level), which can be a source of unnecessary conflicts to add to those that migration triggers in any case, especially when taking place on a large scale. In order to find a solution to the numerous negative social phenomena associated with immigrants, it is necessary to encourage participation of the local level in formation of the state migration policy (multi-level governance). The local level, meaning that of the city and district, plays a more significant role in this process than higher levels (regional, state), since it is in the communities of individual cities and communes that adaptation of immigrants take place, and local governments that are responsible. The majority of immigrants settle in cities, and, as Kris Vancluysen, Maarten Van Craen and Johan Ackaert's research shows, immigrants build a sense of belonging to the local community, city, district and neighbourhood that does not always translate into a feeling of connection with the host state in which they live (Matusz-Protasiewicz 2014: 12).

In Poland, local governments have little experience in constructing their own migration policy. They are largely reliant on state government decisions, which are not made on the basis of multi-level governance. Against this backdrop, Gdańsk's initiative stands out. The Immigrant Integration Model created there is the first comprehensive strategic document at local level to propose specific initiatives for supporting immigrants resident in the city. This document also corresponds to the modern concept of public policy formation known as governance. This is likely to reduce the number and intensity of

social concerns related to migration in the city community. Regardless of the field, any newly formed policy initiates strategic, operational and learning processes. Strategic processes refer to definition of the main objectives of a given policy and allocation of the resources needed for its realisation. Operational processes concern the implementation of the planned actions, and learning processes are the gradual adaptation of the environment of the process to the changes introduced through the strategic and operational processes. Couched in a well-designed public policy, migration can become a new contemporary space for education.

Translated by Benjamin Koschalka

References

- Bauder, Harald, Matheis, Christian (eds) (2016), *Migration policy and practice. Interventions and solutions*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan US.
- Chałupczak, Henryk (2013), "Paradygmat badawczy polityki migracyjnej państwa z perspektywy politologicznej" [in:] Lesińska, Magdalena, Okólski, Marek (eds), *Współczesne polskie migracje: strategie – skutki społeczne – reakcja państwa*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, pp. 77–99. Online: http://www.home.umk.pl/~ptnp/do_pobrania/czytelnia/Chalupczak_Paradygmat_pm.pdf (access: 20.07.2017).
- Deklaracja prezydentów o współdziałaniu miast Unii Metropolii Polskich w dziedzinie migracji* (2017). Gdańsk. Online: <http://www.metropolie.pl/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/Tekst-deklaracji-UMP-z-30-czerwca-2017.pdf> (access: 20.07.2017).
- Duszczyk, Maciej (2013), "Konwergencja polityki imigracyjnej na świecie na przykładzie analizy stosowania wybranych instrumentów", *Problemy Polityki Społecznej* 21 (2): pp. 35–48.
- Ekspertyza podsumowująca doświadczenia teoretyczne i empiryczne nad społecznym i ekonomicznym wymiarem integracji (moduł III – Integracja cudzoziemców w Polsce) (2007). Projekt zrealizowany w ramach Europejskiego Funduszu Społecznego, Sektorowy Program Operacyjny „Rozwój zasobów ludzkich” (działanie 1.1a), pt. *Polityka migracyjna jako instrument promocji zatrudnienia i ograniczania bezrobocia*. Warszawa: Ośrodek Badań nad Migracjami, Wydział Nauk Ekonomicznych Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- Fedas, Anna, Siciarek, Marta, Olech, Piotr (eds) (2016), *Model integracji imigrantów*. Gdańsk: Wyd. Urząd Miejski w Gdańsku, Wydział Rozwoju Społecznego.
- Giza-Poleszczuk, Anna (2007), "Dobre rządzenie i debata publiczna", *Zarządzanie Publiczne* 1: pp. 61–79.

- Górniak, Jarosław (2007), "Ewaluacja w cyklu polityk publicznych" [in:] Mazur, Stanisław (ed.), *Ewaluacja funduszy strukturalnych – perspektywa regionalna*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego i Małopolskiej Szkoły Administracji Publicznej, pp. 11–27.
- Górniak, Jarosław (ed.) (2015), *Ocena wpływu oparta na dowodach. Model dla Polski*. Warszawa: Wyd. Akademia Leona Koźmińskiego.
- Górniak, Jarosław, Mazur, Stanisław (2012), "Analiza polityk publicznych i programowanie w obszarze strategii rozwoju" [in:] Górniak, Jarosław, Mazur, Stanisław (eds), *Zarządzanie strategiczne rozwojem*. Warszawa: Wyd. Ministerstwo Rozwoju Regionalnego, pp. 185–220.
- Hausner, Jerzy (2007), "Polityka a polityka publiczna", *Zarządzanie Publiczne* 1: pp. 43–60.
- Hausner, Jerzy (2008), *Zarządzanie publiczne*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo SCHOLAR.
- Kaczmarczyk, Paweł (2014), "Forum Debaty Publicznej 'Polityka migracyjna Polski wobec wyzwań demograficznych'", *Biuletyn Migracyjny* 50, p. 3. Online: http://biuletynmigracyjny.uw.edu.pl/pliki/pdf/biuletynmigracyjny50_0.pdf (access: 1.10.2017).
- Kaźmierkiewicz, Piotr (2012), *Od strategii do spójnej i czytelnej polityki migracyjnej*, Seria Badań, Ekspertyzy, Rekomendacje. Warszawa: Wyd. Instytut Spraw Publicznych.
- Kozaczka, Dominik (2016), "Polityki publiczne jako proces", *Zoon Politikon* 7: pp. 323–341.
- Łodziński, Sławomir, Szonert, Marek (2017), "Niepolityczna polityka? Kształtowanie się polityki migracyjnej w Polsce w latach 1989–2016", *Studia Migracyjne – Przegląd Polonijny* 2: pp. 39–66.
- Matusz-Protasiewicz, Patrycja (2013), "Rosnąca rola poziomu lokalnego w kreowaniu polityki integracji imigrantów w Unii Europejskiej", *Central and Eastern European Migration Review* 2, No. 2: pp. 75–97.
- Matusz-Protasiewicz, Patrycja (2014), *Wielopoziomowe zarządzanie migracjami. Rola Europejskiego Funduszu na rzecz Integracji Obywateli Państw Trzecich w kształtowaniu polityki integracyjnej w Polsce*. Wrocław: Wyd. Prawnicza i Ekonomiczna Biblioteka Cyfrowa.
- Matyja, Rafał, Siewierska-Chmaj, Anna, Pędziwiatr, Konrad (2015), *Polska polityka migracyjna. W poszukiwaniu nowego modelu*. Warszawa–Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- Okólski, Marek (2008), "Wystąpienie podsumowujące projekt 'Polityka migracyjna jako instrument promocji zatrudnienia i ograniczania bezrobocia'", *Biuletyn Migracyjny – Dodatek* 18: pp. 1–8.
- Polakowski, Michał, Szelewa, Dorota (2013), *Polityka społeczna a problemy migracji*. Warszawa: Wyd. Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, Przedstawicielstwo w Polsce, Fundacja Międzynarodowe Centrum Badań i Analiz (ICRA).
- Polityka migracyjna Polski – stan obecny i postulowane działania* (2012), document accepted by the Council of Ministers on July 31, 2012, prepared by the Department of Migration Policy, ed. Ministerstwo Spraw Wewnętrznych, Departament Polityki Migracyjnej.

- Rajkiewicz, Antoni (2004), "Nad danymi NSP 2002 o migracjach zagranicznych ludności", *Polityka Społeczna* 3: pp. 8–9.
- Skrzypczak, Bogdan (2016), "Pomiędzy społecznym a publicznym – nowa przestrzeń edukacji i refleksji", *Pedagogika Społeczna* 3: pp. 9–36.
- Suwaj, Patrycja J. (2009), "Pojęcie administracji publicznej" [in:] Kudrycka, Barbara, Peters, B. Guy, Suwaj, Patrycja J. (eds), *Nauka administracji*. Warszawa: Wolters Kluwer Polska, pp. 31–56.
- Suwaj, Patrycja J., Szczepankowski, Robert (2009), "Wokół pojęcia polityki i polityki publicznej" [in:] *Nauka administracji*, Barbara Kudrycka, B. Guy Peters, Patrycja J. Suwaj (red.), Wyd. Wolters Kluwer Polska, Warszawa, s. 303–311.
- Szumowski, Witold (2014), "Zarządzanie publiczne – próba systematyzacji koncepcji", *Nauki o Zarządzaniu. Menagement Science* 4: pp. 86–98.
- Szylko-Skoczny, Małgorzata, Duszczyk, Maciej (2010), "Trzy koncepcje polskiej polityki imigracyjnej", *Polityka Społeczna* 7: pp. 2–5.
- Woźnicki, Jerzy (2012), "Nowa dyscyplina – 'nauki o polityce publicznej' usytuowana w dziedzinie nauk społecznych", *Nauka* 1: pp. 133–151.
- Wójcik-Żołądek, Monika (2014), "Współczesne procesy migracyjne: definicje, tendencje, teorie", [in:] "Studia BAS" 4(40), Żołądek, Łukasz (ed.), *Migracje i polityka migracyjna*, pp. 9–35.
- Zybała, Andrzej (2012a), *Polityki publiczne. Doświadczenia w tworzeniu i wykonywaniu programów publicznych w Polsce i w innych krajach. Jak działa państwo, gdy zamierza/chce/musi rozwiązać zbiorowe problemy swoich obywateli?* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Krajowej Szkoły Administracji Publicznej.
- Zybała, Andrzej (2012b), "O lepszą jakość polityk publicznych", *Analizy i Opinie* 127. Wyd. Instytut Spraw Publicznych. Online: <http://www.isp.org.pl/uploads/analyses/2048186281.pdf> (access: 2.05.2017).
- Zybała, Andrzej (2013), *Państwo i społeczeństwo w działaniu. Polityki publiczne wobec potrzeb modernizacji państwa i społeczeństwa*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo DIFIN.
- Zybała, Andrzej (2015), "Polityka publiczna wobec teorii i jej praktyki w Polsce", *Wrocławskie Studia Politologiczne* 18, pp. 28–43.